



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,005	06/11/2004	Daniel J. VanEpps, Jr.	U03-0174.075	4004

24239 7590 12/11/2008  
MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC  
P.O. BOX 13706  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
----------

DANIELS, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/710,005	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VANEPPS, JR., DANIEL J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANTHONY J. DANIELS	<b>Art Unit</b> 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-29 and 31-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-29 and 31-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. The examiner mistakenly indicated in the Office Action 10/9/2007 that a claim for foreign priority has been made by Applicant. No such claim has been made by Applicant; and thus, no foreign priority documents have been received.

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment, filed 8/26/2008, has been entered and made of record. Claims 1-14,16-29 and 31-41 are pending in the application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims and the Dobashi reference have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The amendment to the independent claims 1,22 and 34 (i.e. claims 15 and 30) now creates new dependent claims (i.e. claims 2,23 and 35) which previously did not include the limitation, "...wherein the sheet is altered upon removal from the surface...". Thus, a new ground has been created and this action is made final. See Conclusion section below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 2622

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-8,17,22-25 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Japanese Publication of Koshu (Japanese Publication Number: JP 2003-345255 A) in view of the Japanese Publication of Dobashi (Japanese Publication Number: JP 2002-318405 A).

As to claim 1, Koshu teaches an apparatus for securing (Drawing 1, label “1”) a mobile terminal ([0001], “...object...”), the securing apparatus comprising: a sheet having an upper surface (Drawing 2, surfaces “2-4”) and a lower surface (Drawing 2, cushion layer “5”); and an adhesive applied on the lower surface of the sheet, wherein the sheet may be releasably adhered to the surface of the mobile terminal ([0010], [0011] and [0017]), and wherein the sheet is altered upon removal from the surface ([0015]). The claim differs from Koshu in that it further requires that the mobile terminal include a housing and an imaging device disposed within the housing for capturing an image through a lens and that the sheet covers the lens to substantially prevent image capture.

In the same field of endeavor, Dobashi teaches a digital camera including a sheet acting as a barrier mechanism placed over a lens of the camera to prevent image capture (Drawing 1).

Art Unit: 2622

In light of the teaching of Dobashi, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Koshu and Dobashi to achieve the same security afforded the objects of Koshu. Furthermore, Dobashi teaches that the barrier mechanism acts as protection for the optical system to prevent image capture.

As to claim **2**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the sheet is formed from an opaque material (see Dobashi, barrier mechanism “4”).

As to claim **3**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the lower surface of the sheet comprises a reflective surface (see Dobashi, barrier mechanism “4”).

As to claim **4**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the sheet is selected from a film (see Koshu, [0017], “...film 2...”), paper, a woven fabric, or a non-woven fabric.

As to claim **5**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the adhesive is a pressure-sensitive adhesive (see Koshu, [0016], “...pressure sensitive adhesive...”).

As to claim **6**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the lower surface of the sheet is partially covered with adhesive (see Koshu, [0011]).

As to claim **7**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches securing apparatus as recited in claim 6, wherein the partial adhesive coverage includes the periphery of the lower surface of the sheet (see Koshu, Drawing 2).

Art Unit: 2622

As to claim **8**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 6, wherein the partial adhesive coverage includes all but a portion of the lower surface of the sheet, the portion of the sheet without adhesive being adjacent to the edge of the sheet (see Koshu, Drawing 2).

As to claim **17**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a securing apparatus as recited in claim 1, wherein the alteration of the sheet includes irreversible destruction of the sheet upon removal ([0015]).

As to claim **22**, Koshu teaches a mobile terminal ([0001], "...object...") comprising: a sheet having an upper surface (Drawing 2, surfaces "2-4") and a lower surface (Drawing 2, cushion layer "5"); and an adhesive applied on the lower surface of the sheet, wherein the sheet may be releasably adhered to the surface of the mobile terminal ([0010], [0011] and [0017]); and wherein the sheet is altered upon removal from the surface ([0015]). The claim differs from Koshu in that it further requires that the mobile terminal be used in a wireless communication system and include a housing and an imaging device disposed within the housing for capturing an image through a lens and that the sheet covers the lens to substantially prevent image capture.

In the same field of endeavor, Dobashi teaches a digital camera used in a wireless communication system (Drawing 1 and 14) including a sheet acting as a barrier mechanism placed over a lens of the camera to prevent image capture (Drawing 1). In light of the teaching of Dobashi, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Koshu and Dobashi to achieve the same security afforded the objects of Koshu. Furthermore, Dobashi teaches that the barrier mechanism acts as protection for the optical system to prevent image capture.

Art Unit: 2622

As to claim **23** and **24**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a mobile terminal as recited in claim 22. Although Dobashi does not state it explicitly, **Official Notice** is taken that camera phones are well known and expected in the art. One of ordinary skill would look to apply the method of Koshu to camera phones for the advantages stated in Dobashi.

*It is noted by the examiner that because applicant has failed to timely traverse the old and well known statement above, it is now taken as admitted prior art. See MPEP 2144.03 (c).*

As to claim **25**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a mobile terminal as recited in claim 22, wherein the imaging device is a camera (see Dobashi, Drawing 1).

As to claim **32**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a mobile terminal as recited in claim 22, wherein the alteration of the sheet includes irreversible destruction of the sheet upon removal (see Koshu, [0015]).

As to claim **33**, Koshu, as modified by Dobashi, teaches a mobile terminal as recited in claim 22, wherein the adhesive is a pressure-sensitive adhesive for producing a bond between the sheet and the housing of the mobile terminal or the lens ([0010] and [0011]).

As to claim **34**, claim 34 is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 34 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

2. Claims 8-14,16,18-21,26-29,31,35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobashi (see Publication Number above) in view of the admitted and submitted prior art.

As to claims **8-14,16,18-21,26-29,31,35-41**, the admitted and submitted prior art teaches all of the limitations of these claims. In light of the teaching of the art, one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2622

would recognize that the security labels of this prior art could be applied to the camera of Dobashi. These labels provide can provide proof of whether someone has tampered with the object.

### *Conclusion*

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **ANTHONY J. DANIELS** whose telephone number is (571)272-7362. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AD

11/30/2008

/Sinh N Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622